

Docket No. JM 7343-1
Application No. 10/736,117
Page 5

REMARKS

Entry of the foregoing, re-examination and reconsideration of the subject matter identified in caption, as amended, pursuant to and consistent with 37 C.F.R. §1.112, and in light of the remarks which follow, are respectfully requested.

Claim 1 has been amended to insert the features of canceled claims 8 and 10. Claim 1 also has been amended to provide antecedent basis for textile fabric. Claim 9 has been amended to change its dependency and to correct a typographical error. Claims 1-7, 9 and 11-19 are now pending in this application with claims 12-19 withdrawn from consideration on the merits.

Affirmation is made of the telephonic election of claims 1-11, without traverse, on August 17, 2005.

Claims 1-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,291,011 (Edlund) for the reasons given in paragraph (7) of the Office Action. Claims 1-11 also were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,759,116 (Edlund) for the reasons given in paragraph (8) of the Official Action. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested in view of the above amendment and for at least the reasons which follow.

Claim 1 now specifies the warp yarn density and the weft yarn density of the claimed textile fabric. Neither Edlund '011 nor Edlund '116 discloses yarn densities within the ranges set forth in the present claims. Accordingly, the §102 rejections over these patents should be withdrawn and such action is earnestly requested.

Claims 1-11 were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over the claims of copending Application Nos. 09/996,454 (claims 21 and 22); 10/348,725 (claims 1-5); 10/460,287

Docket No. JM 7343-1
Application No. 10/736,117
Page 6

(claims 1-12) and 10/736,119 (claims 1-10). Reconsideration is requested of this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claims 21 and 22 in Application No. 09/997,454 have been canceled so the obviousness double patenting issue is moot with respect to that application. In Application No. 10/736,119, the claimed textile fabric has a yarn titer of 270-300 tex which is significantly above the maximum titer set forth in the present claims. In Application Nos. 10/348,225 and 10/460,287, the claimed textile fabric has a glass sliver as the weft yarn. Accordingly, the claims of the respective applications are drawn to patentably distinct inventions which are capable of supporting different patents.

Applicants also note that overlap in the scope of any of the claims of the copending applications is not, *per se*, double patenting.

For at least these reasons, the provisional obviousness double patenting rejections should be reconsidered and withdrawn. Such action is earnestly requested.

From the foregoing, further and favorable action in the form of a Notice of Allowance is believed to be next in order and such action is earnestly solicited. If there are any questions concerning this paper or the application in general, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (703) 838-6683 at his earliest convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

JOHNS MANVILLE

Date: Nov 28, 2005

By: Robert D. Touslee
Robert D. Touslee
Registration No. 34,032

P.O. Box 625005
Littleton, CO 80162
(303) 978-3927